

is objection to the first unanimous-consent request. Whatever the Chair feels is appropriate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York be recognized for 3 minutes for a morning business statement, and that the Senator from Kansas, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, then be recognized for 5 minutes for a morning business statement, and that Senator SMITH be able to interrupt when he gets a unanimous consent agreement ready, and immediately following the statement of the Senator from Kansas, the quorum call automatically recur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New York is recognized.

LEGISLATION ON TERRORISM

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, we have just witnessed one of the worst terrorist incidents against the United States since the Beirut bombing in 1983. To date, we have lost 19 young Americans in this cowardly attack that has taken place in Saudi Arabia. One of those killed was a constituent from Long Island, Capt. Christopher J. Adams, of Massapequa Park.

With this as a background, Mr. President, I implore my colleagues to move as expeditiously as we can in seeing to it that the Iranian-Libyan sanctions bill, which passed the Senate unanimously and passed the House of Representatives, 415-0, last week—a similar bill—be taken up, that we appoint conferees, and that we act on it now, because it sends a clear message to Iran and Libya. It provides our President with the tools necessary to see to it that sanctions are imposed.

We are not saying who, nor do we know who has sponsored this particular act of terrorism. But both Iran and Libya have been the chief sponsors of state-sponsored terrorism—war—against the United States, and that is the most cowardly kind of war. I think it is important for us to move now and not to hold this legislation up, because our version might be slightly different from that in the House of Representatives. We can work out those differences. I may not get all that I want.

I am for tough sanctions. I am actually for sanctions that would say, if you are going to deal with Iran and Libya and you are going to buy their oil, you are going to invest with them, then we are not going to do business with you. Other colleagues may have a difference of opinion, but we can work that out.

Let us pass this bill. Let us send a bill now that says we are going to take you on, and that we are going to give our President the ability to deal with these terrorist nations and invoke strong action. Not all of our actions should be military, but we have the ability to take on the Iranians and Libyans and to punish them for their continuous support of terrorist activities.

I hope we can pass this bill today. There is no reason for us not to do it. It passed in December unanimously here. I hope that we will act on this.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

THE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT ACT DOESN'T DESERVE TO DIE

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, when I assumed the chairmanship of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee last year, one of my top priorities was to bring to fruition a comprehensive reform of our many job training programs.

My colleague in that effort on the other side of the aisle is the Senator from Nebraska, Senator KERREY, who has been a stalwart supporter of this effort. We both felt strongly there was much that could be done that would significantly improve and enhance Federal job training programs.

Over the past several years, the General Accounting Office, the inspector general, the Department of Labor, and others, have churned out report after report documenting both the proliferation of Federal job training efforts and the inability of these programs to show results.

The roughly \$5 billion which the Federal Government invests in these programs is small potatoes in our annual trillion-dollar-plus budget. The work of these programs are not front-page news, and the issues they raise are probably regarded as boring and tedious.

Mr. President, nevertheless, the Workforce Development Act, which was approved by a vote of 95 to 2, offered an ideal opportunity to find ways to make Government work better.

The legislation was designed to achieve four basic objectives:

One, to consolidate overlapping and narrowly focused Federal categorical programs to allow for the development of statewide systems to address the needs of all individuals.

Two, to provide the States with sufficient flexibility to focus trading resources on their areas of greatest need, while preserving the core activities supported by the Federal Government in the past.

Three, to develop true partnerships among the educators who provide the academic foundation, the trainers who provide the technical expertise, and the business people who create the jobs for which individuals are being trained.

Four, to shift the focus of accountability from one which looks only at

the front end—"Are Federal regulations being followed to the letter?"—to one which looks at the results—"Are training program participants getting jobs?"

Throughout the process in committee, on the floor, and in conference, various accommodations were made in the inevitable process of resolving competing concerns. Some programs which I had believed were appropriate for consolidation, for example, were dropped out of the bill. Many of the changes made to the bill I originally introduced were not things which I would have preferred.

Nevertheless, these revisions were made at the margin. As we near the conclusion of the conference, which has been ongoing since October, the core objectives of the bill remain intact and remain worthy of the support they received in overwhelming votes in both the House and Senate.

Specifically, the bill consolidates 80 separate programs into a work force and career development block grant to the States. Consolidating these programs will permit the States to develop cohesive systems, with employment and training activities being delivered on a one-stop basis.

Second, the bill assures a foundation of support for the four basic activity that have traditionally received Federal support: employment and training; vocational education; adult education; and services for at-risk youth. At the same time, the bill permits each State to supplement the activities which it needs most, by reserving 25 percent of the funds in a flex account to be distributed among the four core activities in the way chosen by the State.

Third, it creates real incentives for cooperation and coordination among educators, trainers, and the business community by providing a collaborative process both for the development of a single State plan and for decisionmaking regarding the allocation of flex funds.

Finally, the bill gets rid of thousands of pages of statutory and regulatory prescriptions and allows State and local officials to concentrate on results. States must establish benchmarks—a process which entails setting specific goals their programs are supposed to achieve. Incentives and sanctions will be based on performance relative to the benchmarks.

Unfortunately, the opportunity to achieve these goals is on the verge of slipping from our grasp. If this bill dies, it will not do so because it is bad policy. Rather, it will have fallen victim to two disparate but powerful political agendas.

On the one hand, many Democrats see the demise of this bill as an opportunity not only to preserve the status quo and the individual interests it protects, but also to use it as fodder in the sound bites leading to the November elections.

Despite recent allegations to the contrary, this legislation has not been an

all-Republican effort. Both the House and Senate have made every effort to obtain bipartisan support, and large bipartisan majorities in both bodies approved the legislation. No one could be a stronger defender of the need of this type of innovative approach to Government than Senator KERREY of Nebraska.

I would like to suggest, however, that the conference proposal reflects a number of concessions that were made in an attempt to address concerns raised by the administration—and I believe that we have done so, not all of them exactly as the administration would have wished but now the administration has withdrawn support—including the establishment of mandatory career grant programs for dislocated workers in every State; a 50-percent reduction in the size of the flex account; the separation of Wagner-Peyser funds from the block grant; the abandonment of the Federal partnership in favor of enhancing the authorities of the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education; and the establishment of mandatory local boards.

We are now in the position of being told that not only are these concessions which were made insufficient, but also that provisions which were never a part of either bill, such as the \$1.3 billion earmark for dislocated workers, are the price of the administration's support.

At the opposite end of the spectrum are those who have seized the bill as a platform to debate issues which have nothing to do with the purpose or provisions of this legislation. For example, one of the major specific criticisms leveled by family groups is that the legislation does not abolish the Department of Education. Our efforts to assure that individuals get the information and training they need to make their own choices and to pursue their own dreams have been turned on their head and have been mischaracterized as a Federal plot to dictate career and education choices.

Each of these groups has set a list of their complaints about the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of these complaints, along with a brief summary of the conference proposal, appear in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, to conclude, the alliance of those who want continued preeminence of Federal bureaucracies with those who will settle for nothing less than their total dismantlement threaten to turn a solid piece of legislation into nothing more than a fundraising tool.

Good Government is pretty boring stuff compared to the adrenalin charge that can be produced by allegations that Republicans are insensitive to the needs of American workers, or that the Federal Government is engaged in a

conspiracy to undermine the rights and freedoms of individuals. Both sides would settle for the status quo.

Mr. President, I think it is very sad to see us at a point when we should be able to survive these potent political forces and being willing to take some small steps forward to address the very thing that most Americans would like to see, and that is, the control of the Federal Government dictating every aspect of initiatives that could bear real fruition at the State and local level.

I would like to yield a minute or whatever time I have left, if I may, to Senator KERREY of Nebraska to make a brief comment.

EXHIBIT 1

ANALYSIS OF CONCERNS EXPRESSED BY PRESIDENT CLINTON IN LETTER TO CONFEREES

Authorization Level. The President believes the authorization level for the bill should be set at \$5.7 billion, which represents his fiscal year 1997 budget request for the programs included in the block grant.

The conference proposal is to authorize "such sums," which implies no limit on future appropriations and which is a practice used many times in the past in launching new initiatives.

Dislocated Workers. Administration officials have requested that a minimum of \$1.3 billion be earmarked for dislocated workers.

The conference proposal does not include such an earmark, as such a proposal was never part of either the House or the Senate bill. The purpose of this legislation is to get away from the "categorization" of individuals to allow the development of a system which works for all in need of its services. States with large dislocated worker populations can allocate flex account funds to serve them, and dislocated workers are specifically identified as a group for which benchmarks must be developed.

Vouchers. The President believes that all services (with a few limited exceptions) to dislocated workers should be delivered through vouchers or "skill grants."

The conference agreement requires every state to establish a pilot program to serve dislocated workers with "career grants." The pilot must be of sufficient size, scope, and quality to demonstrate the effectiveness of career grants. States are specifically authorized to deliver all training services through career grants, should they choose to do so.

The bill approved by the Senate did not require that vouchers be used under any circumstances—due to concerns that mandating vouchers would impose substantial administrative burdens on states and reduce state flexibility in determining the most effective means of service delivery. In addition, past experience with federal student loan programs has underscored both the importance and the difficulty of putting into place appropriate "gate-keeping" procedures to assure that participants are not ripped off by training providers.

Given the seriousness of these concerns, I believe we have met the President more than half way. If vouchers work as well as he believes, they will undoubtedly be expanded. If they present the problems I anticipate, the pilot projects can offer guidance regarding whether or not they can be corrected.

School-to-Work. The Administration wants the School-to-Work Opportunities Act to be authorized and funded as a separate program outside the block grant.

The conference agreement would repeal this Act on July 1, 1998, the same date that

approximately 80 other federal programs will be repealed. After that time, states would be able to use block grant funds to continue their school-to-work programs.

Any state wishing to participate in the federal school-to-work program will have the opportunity to sign up prior to this repeal date. By all accounts, the program is popular with governors and other officials—who would presumably exercise their discretion to continue it with block grant funds. It makes no sense, however, to maintain a separate school-to-work program operating on a parallel track with the block grant.

Accountability. The Administration indicates that the bill lacks "accountability."

Accountability for results—which is virtually non-existent in current programs—is a major focus of this reform legislation. It appears that the Administration's view of "accountability" is maintaining maximum federal control over job training programs.

The conference agreement addresses strong concerns voiced earlier by the Administration about provisions of the Senate bill which combined offices within the Department of Labor and the Department of Education into a Federal Partnership to administer the block grant. I had felt it was important to have at the federal level the same coordination and cooperation we were seeking at the state level, but I abandoned that approach in the face of the Administration's objections. These new Administration concerns seem to undercut the objective of the legislation to enhance state responsibility and flexibility. It makes little sense to me to develop a bill which repeals current restrictions, only to establish a situation where federal Cabinet Secretaries are in the position of re-creating them through regulation.

Local Elected Officials. The Administration would like the local workforce development boards to be structured more like the existing Private Industry Councils [PICS]—particularly with respect to the role of local elected officials.

The conference proposal gives substantial responsibility to local elected officials, but it admittedly and intentionally does not recreate PICs. Local elected officials are part of the collaborative process at the state level, making a variety of key decisions regarding the statewide system. In addition, at the local level, they appoint members of the local board, assist in developing the local plan, and provide continuous input to the board in carrying out its functions.

Again, earlier Administration concerns were addressed when Senate conferees agreed to require the establishment of local boards—something which was not required in our original bill.

Control of Education. The Administration believes that education programs should remain under the jurisdiction of the state and local education entities which currently oversee them.

This has always been the objective of the Senate bill and is included in the conference proposal.

ANALYSIS OF CONCERNS EXPRESSED IN "CAPITOL HILL EAGLE ALERT" DATED MAY 3, 1996

Schools as "Workforce Development" Centers. The alert indicates that schools will "train" students, not "educate" them.

A solid academic foundation is critical for every student. Nothing in the Workforce Development Act changes the fundamental mission of our schools to "educate" students.

Workforce Development Boards. The alert indicates that workforce development boards will decide what jobs are needed and what youth can be trained for them.

That is an inaccurate description of the function of workforce development boards.

The primary function of workforce development boards is to bring together business and community leaders who can accurately identify the economic development and workforce training needs in a local community, in order to maximize the number of jobs available for individuals seeking work in the community. Such information will be useful in designing training programs that meet the needs of the unemployed and businesses seeking qualified employees. Local workforce development boards do not replace, nor take authority away from, local school boards and parent organizations whose focus is on secondary school students and programs.

Labor Market Information System. The alert contends that a Labor Market Information System "would compile data about every child—academic, medical, personal, family, attitudinal, and behavioral—into a computer data base, then give access to all future employers and the government."

There is no truth to this statement. Labor market information serves a critical purpose in providing accurate information about national unemployment rates and workforce trends (such as whether more jobs are available in manufacturing, retail, or service industries.) At the state and local level, labor market information includes listings of job openings supplied voluntarily by employers, which individuals seeking employment can review through public employment service offices. Nothing in the Workforce Development Act authorizes the collection of personal information on individuals (including youth) for use by employers or the government.

Department of Labor Authority over Education. The alert contends that the legislation gives Labor Secretary Reich control over local schools.

Elementary and secondary education is the responsibility of state and local officials and remains so under this bill. Neither Secretary Reich nor any other federal official is assigned "control" over local schools.

State Legislatures and School Boards. The alert contends that responsibility for local schools is taken from State legislatures and local school boards and transferred to the Governor and local workforce development boards.

This statement is not accurate. The conference proposal makes no changes in education governance at the state and local levels. From the beginning, the Senate bill has assured that responsibility for schools stayed in the hands of those currently designated under State law.

Department of Education. The alert criticizes the bill because it does not abolish the Department of Education.

That is accurate; it doesn't. Bills written with the express purpose of abolishing the Department have been introduced in Congress. The purpose of the Workforce Development Act is to reform federal job training programs and to enhance the responsibility and flexibility of state and local officials.

SUMMARY OF WORKFORCE AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT ACT

The Workforce and Career Development Act consolidates approximately 80 job training and training-related programs into a single grant to the States. The purposes of the Act are to:

Provide greater flexibility to the States in designing workforce systems which fit their specific needs;

Eliminate duplication of effort and reduce the regulatory burden created by numerous categorical federal programs;

Encourage greater coordination of job training and training-related education programs;

Improve the effectiveness of federal workforce development efforts by focusing on program results.

TITLE I: STATEWIDE WORKFORCE AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT SYSTEMS

State Systems.—Statewide workforce development systems are established through a single allotment of funds to each State. Minimum percentages of funds will be allocated to specific activities, as follows: 34 percent—Employment and Training; 24 percent—Vocational Education; 16 percent—At-Risk Youth; 6 percent—Adult Education and Literacy.

The remaining 20 percent of the funds may be distributed among any of these four activities, as the State may decide. Decisions regarding the allocation of funds from this "flex account" is made through a collaborative process involving, among others, the Governor, the eligible agencies for vocational and adult education, local elected officials, and the private sector. The purpose of the flex account is to permit each State to allocate resources to the activities most needed in that State.

State Plans.—An overall strategic plan for the State is also developed through the collaborative process. The plan describes:

State goals and benchmarks for the system, including how the State will use its funds to meet those goals and benchmarks;

How the State will establish systems for one-stop career centers to effectively and efficiently deliver training services to all individuals; and

How the vocational, adult education and literacy, and at-risk youth needs of the State will be met.

State Governance.—The Governor administers and exercises authority over the employment and training and at-risk youth activities in the State. The agencies eligible for vocational education and adult education administer and exercise authority over vocational education activities and adult education activities, respectively, in accordance with State law.

Local Workforce Development Bonds.—Each State must establish local workforce development boards which, at a minimum, include a majority of business representatives, and representatives of education and workers. The boards: (1) develop a local plan outlining the workforce development activities to be carried out in the local area; (2) designate or certify one-stop career center providers (consistent with criteria in the state plan); (3) conduct oversight of local programs; and (4) award competitive grants to eligible at-risk youth providers. The Governor certifies the boards annually, based in part on how well the local programs it oversees are meeting expected levels of performance.

Accountability.—Each State must, at a minimum, establish specific benchmarks designed to meet the goals of providing meaningful employment and improving academic, occupational, and literacy skills. These benchmarks will be used to measure progress toward goals established for populations including, at a minimum: (1) low-income individuals; (2) disclosed workers; (3) at-risk youth; (4) individuals with disabilities; (5) veterans; and (6) individuals with limited literacy skills.

The Secretaries of Labor and Education may award incentive grants or impose sanctions, depending upon the success or failure of the State toward meeting such goals and benchmarks.

Transition.—States may obtain waivers in order to begin establishing their statewide systems prior to the implementation of the block grant on July 1, 1998. In addition, States may request technical assistance

from the Secretaries in developing their state plans.

Federal Administration.—The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education will enter into an interagency agreement on how the new system will be administered at the Federal level.

National Programs.—National activities include: national assessments of statewide systems; the continuation of the Bureau of Labor Statistics labor market information programs; the establishment of a national center for research in education and workforce development; national emergency grants for dislocated workers; and programs for Native Americans, migrant and seasonal farm workers, and the outlying areas.

Authorization Levels.—"Such sums" for fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

TITLE II: WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES

Employment Service.—The Wagner-Peyser Act is amended to provide that the activities carried out by the Employment Service will be linked to the one-stop career center system established in each State;

Vocational Rehabilitation.—Title 1 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 is amended to link vocational rehabilitation services with the statewide systems including, to the extent feasible, the State goals and benchmarks.

Job Corps.—Job Corps remains a separate, federal residential program for at-risk youth. A National Job Corps Review Panel will conduct a review of the Job Corps program and make recommendations on improvements, including the closure of 5 Job Corps centers by September 30, 1997, and an additional 5 centers by September 30, 2000.

TITLE III: MUSEUMS AND LIBRARIES

The bill provides for the establishment of an Institute of Museums and Library Services, consolidating the functions of the Institute of Museum Services, the Library Services and Construction Act, Title II of the Higher Education Act, and Part F of the Technology for Education Act.

TITLE IV: HIGHER EDUCATION

Connie Lee.—The bill provides for the privatization of the College Construction Loan Insurance Association (Connie Lee).

Sallie Mae.—The bill provides for the privatization of the Student Loan Marketing Association (Sallie Mae).

Higher Education Repeals.—The bill repeals approximately 45 programs authorized under the Higher Education Act which did not receive appropriations in fiscal year 1996.

TITLE V: GENERAL PROVISIONS

Repeals.

The following programs will sunset immediately upon enactment:

State Legalization Impact Assistance Grant (SLIAG)

Displaced Homemakers Self-Sufficiency Assistance Act

Title II of Public Law 95-250

Appalachian Vocational and Other Education Facilities & Operations

Job Training for the Homeless Demonstration Project

The following programs will sunset on July 1, 1998, the date by which each State must implement its statewide system:

Job Training Partnership Act

Carl Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act

Adult Education Act

School Dropout Assistance Act

Adult Education for the Homeless

Library Services and Construction Act

School-to-Work Opportunities Act

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM]. As a consequence of making the

judgment that this bill is too important to let die because perhaps 10, 20, or 30 million American families can benefit from the Workforce Development Act, and will benefit.

There are not very many pieces of legislation quite like this one where I am 100 percent certain that 2, 3, or 4 years from now someone will come up on the street and say, "My family has \$6,000 more income as a consequence of this piece of legislation. It has benefited me in that fashion."

I am quite convinced this is one of the most important pieces of legislation that this Congress has taken up. I am very, very grateful to the Senator from Kansas for saying, get all parties back together, Republicans and Democrats. There is not a lot of big money trying to push this thing one way or the other. That sometimes makes things more difficult. But on behalf of 20 or 30 million American families out there who could be tremendously benefited if we change this law in this fashion, I hope the advice of the distinguished Senator from Kansas is taken and that we are able to produce a piece of legislation that will be supported and get this law changed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMITH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at the hour of 4 p.m. today the Senate lay aside any pending amendments to the DOD authorization bill and Senator PRYOR be recognized to offer his amendment regarding GATT; and immediately following the reporting by the clerk, Senator HATCH be recognized to offer a relevant perfecting amendment limited to 30 minutes equally divided in the usual form, with an additional 10 minutes under the control of Senator SPECTER and an additional 5 minutes under the control of Senator PRYOR; and following the disposition of the second-degree amendment, if agreed to, Senator PRYOR be recognized to offer a further second-degree amendment and there be 30 minutes time for debate prior to a motion to table to be equally divided in the usual form, with an additional 10 minutes under the control of Senator SPECTER and an additional 5 minutes under the control of Senator PRYOR; that following the conclusion or yielding back of time, Senator LOTT be recognized to move to table the second-degree PRYOR amendment, and no other amendments or motions be in order prior to the motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I further ask that if the HATCH amendment is

not agreed to, it be in order for the majority leader to make a motion to table following 30 minutes of debate to be equally divided in the usual form, with 10 additional minutes under the control of Senator SPECTER and 5 additional minutes under the control of Senator PRYOR, and no further amendments or motions be in order prior to that motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

AMENDMENT NO. 4218

(Purpose: To eliminate taxpayer subsidies for recreational shooting programs, and to prevent the transfer of federally-owned weapons, ammunition, funds, and other property to a private Corporation for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and Firearms Safety)

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I call up an amendment that is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), for himself, Mr. SIMON, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BUMPERS, and Mr. KENNEDY, proposes an amendment numbered 4218.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want to hear at least a portion of the amendment read to get some understanding of what the amendment is. I do not choose to continue the objection. At this point, I want to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue reading.

The bill clerk read as follows:

At the end of title X, add the following:

Subtitle G—Civilian Marksmanship

SEC. 1081. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the "Self Financing Civilian Marksmanship Program Act of 1996".

SEC. 1082. PRIVATE SHOOTING COMPETITIONS AND FIREARM SAFETY PROGRAMS.

Nothing in this subtitle prohibits any private person from establishing a privately financed program to support shooting competitions or firearms safety programs.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title X, add the following:

Subtitle G—Civilian Marksmanship

SEC. 1081. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the "Self Financing Civilian Marksmanship Program Act of 1996".

SEC. 1082. PRIVATE SHOOTING COMPETITIONS AND FIREARM SAFETY PROGRAMS.

Nothing in this subtitle prohibits any private person from establishing a privately financed program to support shooting competitions or firearms safety programs.

SEC. 1083. REPEAL OF CHARTER LAW FOR THE CORPORATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE AND SAFETY.

(a) REPEAL OF CHARTER.—The Corporation for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and Firearms Safety Act (title XVI of Public Law 104-106; 110 Stat. 515; 36 U.S.C. 5501 et seq.), except for section 1624 of such Act (110 Stat. 522), is repealed.

(b) RELATED REPEALS.—Section 1624 of such Act (110 Stat. 522) is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), by striking out "and 4311" and inserting in lieu thereof "4311, 4312, and 4313";

(2) by striking out subsection (b); and

(3) in subsection (c), by striking out "on the earlier of—" and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof "on October 1, 1996."

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, this amendment would prevent the Government from providing a \$76 million Federal endowment to American gun clubs.

Senators SIMON, BUMPERS, FEINSTEIN, and KENNEDY are original cosponsors of this amendment. The amendment addresses what I view as a fatal flaw in the new version of the Civilian Marksmanship Program, which was established by the Congress in the fiscal 1996 Department of Defense authorization bill—last year's bill.

Before I explain why this amendment is necessary, I think it is important to understand the history of the old Civilian Marksmanship Program. The CMP was first begun in 1903, soon after the Spanish-American War, and at a time when civilian marksmanship training was believed to be important for military preparedness. Back then, some Federal officials were concerned that recruits often were unable literally to shoot straight. The officials believed that a trained corps of civilians with marksmanship skills would be useful to prepare for future military conflicts.

Mr. President, that may have made sense in 1903, but we are in 1996. The Spanish-American War ended more than 90 years ago, and, not to surprise people, but things have changed. So has the Civilian Marksmanship Program. Over the years, the program has been transferred from the training program for military personnel to a plain old shooting program for gun enthusiasts.

Tax dollars have been used for nothing more than promoting rifle training for civilians through over 1,100 private gun clubs and organizations. Through the program, the Federal Government has joined forces with the National Rifle Association to sponsor annual summertime shooting competitions for civilians. The program has included donations, loans, and the sale of weapons, ammunition, and other shooting supplies. It has purchased bullets for Boy Scouts, taught them how to shoot guns.

Mr. President, the Defense Department concluded long ago that the Army-run Civilian Marksmanship Program does not serve any military purpose. It concluded that there is no "discernible link" between the program and our Nation's military readiness.